

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8-37, 39-43, 45-50, and 52 are all the claims pending in the application. By this amendment, claim 7 is cancelled.

Claims 19-33, 35-37, 43, 45, 47, 48, 51, and 52 have been withdraw from consideration. Accordingly, claims 1, 17, 34, and 49 are the only independent claims that are currently examined.

Objections

The Examiner has objected to claim 8, indicating that the word “Mobil” regarding the GSM standard should be replaced with “Mobile.” In response, Applicant has amended claim 8 in the manner suggested by the Examiner. Moreover, the Examiner has also amended claim 6 (and other claims) to refer to the “Global System for Mobile Communication.”

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-18, 34, 39-42, 46, and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by LaDue (US 2006/0133423).

Claim 1

With respect to independent claim 1, Applicant has the claim recite the features of dependent claim 7. That is, Applicant has amended the claim to recite that the communication device includes a *buffering device* is operably connected to a bus between the master microprocessor and the security identity module.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection at least because LaDue does not disclose all of the recitations of claim 1. For example, LaDue does not disclose the claimed communication device including a buffering device is operably connected to a bus between the master microprocessor and the security identity module.

The Examiner points to LaDue as disclosing a GSM mobile telephone system with a microprocessor and a subscriber identity module (SIM). An octave sampling and conversion engine (OSE) 90a includes a random access memory storage (RAM) 139, which is asserted as corresponding to the recited “buffering device.”

However, LaDue’s RAM 139 is not is operably connected to a bus *between the master microprocessor and the security identity module*.

Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 is deficient at least for this reason and Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of independent claim 1.

Claims 2-16

Moreover, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of dependent claims 2-16 at least because of their dependency from claim 1.

Claim 17

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 17 at least because LaDue does not disclose all of the recitations of claim 17. For example, LaDue does not disclose the claimed communication device including a buffering device that is operable to receive standard SMS messages input using a keypad on the communication device and free-hand created messages input using a free-hand compatible data entry device.

LaDue is silent regarding this feature. For example, LaDue’s RAM 139 does not receive SMS messages input using a keyboard *and* using a free-hand compatible data entry device.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of independent claim 17.

Claim 18

Moreover, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of dependent claim 18 at least because of its dependency from claim 17.

Claim 34

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 34 at least because LaDue does not disclose all of the recitations of claim 34. For example, LaDue does not disclose the claimed communication device including a quantizer operable to divide said free-hand drawn message into a plurality of sub messages.

LaDue is silent regarding this feature, and the Examiner has not pointed to any feature in LaDue that would reasonably correspond to this feature.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of independent claim 34.

Claims 39-49

Moreover, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of dependent claims 39-42 at least because of their dependency from claim 34.

Claim 49

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 49 at least because LaDue does not disclose all of the recitations of claim 49. For example, LaDue does not disclose the claimed communication device including a first conversion device operable to convert said message into a freehand drawn message, the message received by said receiving portion being a standard SMS message.

LaDue is silent regarding this feature, and the Examiner has not pointed to any feature in LaDue that would reasonably correspond to this feature.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of independent claim 49.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/John M. Bird/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

John M. Bird
Registration No. 46,027

Date: May 21, 2007